miration of what they saw in this country. He felt that in this they were sincere, and he could account for their sensations. In their own countries generally, and more especially in France, their monuments were the productions of highly refined and well-educated minds. The government was generous in the funds appropriated to public buildings; and painting and sculpture, as handmaids of architecture, were properly employed to give every appropriate embellishment to their edifices. In fact they had *their* art intellectual and highly wrought. But we, with a niggardly government, as regards public buildings,—with ministers who rarely were able to appreciate art,—had to follow another path, that of public utility; and we had *our* art—an art of another direction and another quality, containing in itself elements of grandeur and simplicity, as witness our broad and well-paved streets and squares, our parks, our public institutions, which, with few pretensions to decorative art, had breadth of character and largeness of scale, and these impressed the foreigner. One, who at Paris had considered the English as barbarians in art, and unworthy regard for their imaginative qualities, came recently to London, and frankly acknowledged, "I should have visited England twenty-five years ago: a new world of thought is opened to me, and now in seeing what you have done in your country, I have other thoughts, and see architecture in a new point of view." Mr. Donaldson said, he felt convinced, that if all the difficulties of the English architect were considered, and people passed in review all the churches, colleges, lunatic asylums, workhouses, bridges, viaducts, country houses, prisons, and the various other public buildings which had been erected in the United Kingdom within the last thirty years, England need not be ashamed to be compared with any other country in Europe. He felt that the English architect had not full justice done him; that the present tone of criticism was to depreciate all modern works of architecture. He considered this very prejudicial to the progress of the art. The architect ought to be encouraged by seeking out his merits rather than by dwelling upon his defects; and instead of being depressed, he would be stimulated to higher efforts. The Great Exhibition was a great lesson for the architect, as it was for every other department of invention; and the noble and generous rivalry which it involved must be beneficial. All must have observed how brilliantly shine the foreigners in objects of taste; but there was that in the English character which would render such a comparison most useful: we had confidence in our own powers, a consciousness that a blind idea of excellence which did not exist is most hurtful: we feel that an effort is necessary to equal the ability we find in others: we seek progress, improvement, excellence; and with a determination to produce these, success cannot be doubtful. Architecture must advance with the general developement of nobler qualities throughout all the productions of intelligence and beauty which must now take place for years to come. The Professor concluded by recommending the younger members of the profession to note as more instructive the beauties rather than the defects of all works of art that they saw, and they would thus lay up a valuable store of rich materials for future applications, and accustom their minds to beautiful thoughts alone, without encumbering their memories with deformities, with which a spirit of adverse criticism is too apt to overcharge the thoughts and feelings.

At another part of the evening Mr. Donaldson said, It would be well if young architects went through a course of chemistry and geology. He referred to the great advantages offered by University College and King's College, under the most experienced masters. As to composition of papers, though of course all gentlemen were not gifted alike, still, if members would write naturally and content themselves with simple relations of facts and observations, it would be very useful in results.

Mr. H. T. Braithwaite said that, in reviewing the events of the association during the past session, he might be permitted to congratulate it on a marked advance; and it was the more allowable for him, although himself a member, to do so, because of a sort of amphibious quality, by which he had the privilege of existing both in the architectural element and out of it. For the amateur was, as it were, a double-natured or double-minded animal,—not in the hypocritical sense, but in that which rendered him a link between the profoundly professional and the superficially ignorant. He also (the amateur) was the interpreter to the many of the languages spoken in the scientific and artistic worlds. This he said, not as wrote excellent Martin Tupper, to glorify his office, but to show that he had a right of double sympathy, and was, therefore, justified in congratulating the association, although, as far as he might, he belonged to it. In the course of papers read during the last session, they had ranged through every elevation of subject, from the loftiest summits of speculation to the lowest depths of ordinary practice. These dreams and facts,—bright imaginations and solid realities,—had displayed themselves by turns in all their varied importance. That the Architectural Exhibition was settled on a secure basis must be a matter of satisfaction to all who had still any position or reputation to gain. Notwithstanding the discord between the muses at the Royal Academy,—although Painting was playing General to their poor Cordelia,—still would Architecture assert her position, and re-arise in renewed security.

Mr. Robert Kerr and Mr. Creke also addressed the meeting, the latter urging that the society should incorporate itself.

ARRANGEMENT OF SMOKE FLUES.

Allow me the advantage of your very useful publication to offer a few suggestions to architects and builders on the subject of chimneys. Their appearance in half the streets is a disgrace to the town; and with respect to the purposes of their construction, they appear to me equally open to objection. But to render this apparent, and what I propose as improvements obvious, let us first inquire the purpose to be fulfilled in the construction of a chimney. This, it will be replied, is to convey away in the most convenient manner the smoke and gases of combustion from the fire-grate. True: we know, however, that it does more—that the chimney as it becomes heated, operates as a draught and encourages the ascent of the smoke. In addition to this, it is, however, equally well known to afford a channel for a downward current of cold air.

The arrangement of a stack of chimneys as at present constructed, is that of a series of perpendicular shafts running parallel with each other, from the fire-grate of every room, to the house-top. Instead of which, my plan would be, the adoption of one central shaft, rising from the kitchen grate in the basement floor, into which the smoke from all the other fires in the house should be conveyed by oblique tubes in connexion with it; these cylindrical tubes being made valvular, or not, as may be found necessary.

The advantages of this arrangement, I conclude, would be as follows: first—that of cutting off the downward current of cold air from the chamber containing the fire, excepting the kitchen. Second—augmenting the draught, and preventing the smoke from returning into the room (as in cases of smoky chimneys), the increased temperature of the central shaft and greater elevation fulfilling the purpose. Third—the preservation of the furniture and cleanliness, the sweeping being effected from the central shaft, and this opening into the kitchen. Fourth—economy, both in space and expense of construction, there being but one chimney instead of a dozen. Fifth, and last—improved appearance:—see how sadly house-tops are now disfigured by the multitude of chimney-tops and other devices in use for the cure of smoky chimneys—all of which, I imagine, would be rendered unnecessary by elongating the central shaft.

And next, Sir, in relation both to the cure of smoky chimneys and the ventilation of our apartments, I would beg leave to make another suggestion. It is an established fact, that each pound of coal requires for its combustion about five pounds of atmospheric air; and as, in the present arrangement of our fire-places, this quantity can only be obtained when the room-door is shut by currents of air drawn down the chimney, and through the apertures of the door and window-frames, subjecting every person in the apartment to great inconvenience, I propose to supply the amount of air required from a shaft or tube descending down or parallel with the smoke-shaft, by a pipe in connection with it, and terminating by an oblique opening downwards into the ash-pit of the grate, or other suitable situation below the fire-bars. Or I would supply the fire of the chamber above with air from the chamber below, and thus ventilate the apartment, allowing it to pass between the petals of a flower, or other ornamental device in the centre of the ceiling, and thence conducted, between it and the floor, by a tube to the fire, admitting it, as in the former instance, below the grate by a suitably protected opening.

C. Searle, M.D.

THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

It has always been my conviction that in order to render architecture popular, it should be associated as much as possible with public convenience and gratification; so that besides the mere impression arising from beauty and grandeur, there may be the more general and intelligible satisfaction derived from the actual use and benefit afforded, and consequently a disposition to acquiesce in the public expenditure for such purposes.

I was led into this reflection when, passing through Great Russell-street the other day, I observed a considerable crowd of persons waiting for the opening of the British Museum; and, as if to render the circumstance the more striking, the people were *prevented by the police* from occupying that side next the building, where there could be no persons to be incommoded, and were actually compelled to stand along in front of the opposite houses, inconveniencing the inhabitants and the public, and exposed to all the chances of the weather. These circumstances naturally make one exclaim with some indignation, what is the use of a spacious court and stately porticoes, if they are to be thus churlishly withheld from the public at the time and for the very occasion for which, if they have any use, they are obviously adapted? It might be curious to learn what official or formal objections might be alleged to justify this exclusion, after the test to which the good manners of the people have been of late so extensively and successfully subjected? In default of all reasons, I can only attribute this to the same unhappy feeling of official exclusiveness which used to pervade all public matters of this nature, and which has been put to shame, and its effects almost extinguished by exposure to a comparison with the more liberal and enlightened policy of our continental neighbours.

Viator.

Mr. W. Tyson, F.S.A.—It is with the deepest regret we have to record the death of an old and valuable inhabitant of Bristol, Mr. W. Tyson, at his residence, Dove-street, Kingsdown, in his 67th year. He has passed nearly his whole life in that city: in the early part of his career he was with an eminent lawyer, Mr. Coates, after which, always having a leaning to antiquarian researches, he took a shop in Clare-street for the purpose of selling old and curious works. Ultimately he became connected with the *Bristol Mirror*, on which he has been occupied for the last twenty-five years of his life. From his pen we have read many able and interesting papers, more particularly on the antiquities of Bristol. As one of his contemporaries says, "One of the boundary stones of Bristol is gone." Mr. Tyson was a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries, and he took a very active part, as may be remembered, in the Archæological meeting this year: he was the local secretary, and read some very curious papers. We knew him personally, and esteemed him highly.